## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

Shakyla Betts,	)
Plaintiff,	)
vs.	) No. 1:24-cv-02197-JMS-M
ARMOND BROWN, RUAN TRANSPORTATION CORPORATION, and PRAXAIR, INC. a/k/a LINDE, INC,	) ) )
Defendants.	)

## **ORDER**

Defendants removed Plaintiff's action to this Court on December 12, 2024, alleging that this Court has diversity jurisdiction over this action. [Filing No. 1.] Local Rule 81-1 provides:

Within 30 days after the filing of the notice of removal, every plaintiff who has not filed a motion to remand must file a statement responding to the notice of removal's allegations as to the citizenship of the parties and the amount in controversy. If the plaintiff lacks sufficient information upon which to form a belief about those allegations despite meeting and conferring in good faith with the removing party about them, the plaintiff may so state.

On January 1, 2025, Plaintiff filed a motion to remand but then withdrew it on February 21, 2025. [Filing No. 12; Filing No. 20.] On March 10, 2025, Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint in this Court, [Filing No. 25], but has not filed a response to Defendants' Notice of Removal as required by Local Rule 81-1. The Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to comply with Local Rule 81-1 by **May 13**, **2025.** The Court reminds Plaintiff that an allegation of her residence is inadequate to establish her citizenship for purposes of diversity jurisdiction. *McMahon v. Bunn-O-Matic Corp.*, 150 F.3d 651, 653 (7th Cir. 1998). Residency and citizenship are not the same, and it is citizenship that matters for purposes of diversity. *Meyerson v. Harrah's East Chicago Casino*, 299 F.3d 616, 617 (7th Cir.

2002). An individual's citizenship for purposes of diversity jurisdiction "is the place one intends to remain." *Dakuras v. Edwards*, 312 F.3d 256, 258 (7th Cir. 2002).

Date: 4/28/2025

Hon. Jane Magnus-Stinson, Judge United States District Court Southern District of Indiana

Distribution via ECF to all counsel of record